

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PLAINTIFF

v.

CASE NO. 8:12-CR-00344

RANDALL DAVID DUE

DEFENDANT

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Defendant Randall David Due's "First Amendment Petition Appeal of Order" (doc. 466), "Brief in Opposition to Reassignment Order and Trial Order" (doc. 467), "Demand for GSA SF24 Bid Bond" (doc. 468), "First Amendment Petition and 5th Amendment Full Disclosure Request" (doc. 470), and "First Amendment Petition for Full Disclosure Regarding Government Witnesses" (doc. 476).

These filings are, in large part, substantively duplicative of Defendant's numerous prior filings. As the Court has determined time and again, Defendant's various demands and arguments are unsupported by fact or law. To the extent Defendant's "First Amendment Petition Appeal of Order" (doc. 466) may be considered a motion for reconsideration or a motion to dismiss for violation of his right to a speedy trial, this issue has already been properly and correctly considered in detail by the Court (see Order entered August 12, 2014, doc. 459), and Defendant's motion is again DENIED.

Defendant's "Brief in Opposition to Reassignment Order and Trial Order" (doc. 467) appears to generally protest these proceedings and seek recusal of the judges for an alleged conflict of interest. This filing is unsupported by fact or law, and is hereby DENIED.

Defendant's "Demand for GSA SF24 Bid Bond" (doc. 468), which demands that the Court produce any "original wet ink Bid Bonds" and allegedly related documents, is unsupported by fact or law and is hereby DENIED.

Defendant's "First Amendment Petition and 5th Amendment Full Disclosure Request" (doc. 470), which demands disclosure of all documents, papers, and instructions presented to the jury at the trial of his co-defendant, is unsupported by fact or law and is hereby DENIED.

Defendant's "First Amendment Petition for Full Disclosure Regarding Government Witnesses" (doc. 476) is also DENIED.

To the extent that any prior filings of the Defendant may be considered to be motions that the Court has not yet ruled upon, such motions are DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 4th day of September, 2014.

/s/ Robert T. Dawson  
Honorable Robert T. Dawson  
United States District Judge